



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: :
Baldwin : Art Unit: 3661
AN 09/133,741 : Examiner: Thu Nguyen
Filed: 08/13/1998 : Atty's Docket: TD-143
For: Improved Triangle Clipping for 3D Graphics

**RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH
THE REQUIREMENTS OF 37 CFR 1.192(c)**

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Alexandria, VA 22313

Sir:

Enclosed is an amended appeal brief for the above application. Four complete copies are included, three bound and one unbound. The amended brief is being filed in response to a Notification of Non-Compliance mailed 06/30/2003.

As requested by the Examiner, the status of all the claims are now indicated, and a copy of Claim 14 is included. A copy of Claims 43-46 is not included because those claims have been canceled by prior amendments and are not subject of this appeal.

As requested by the Examiner, the proposed amendments have been taken out, but it is noted that the Board is allowed to make a recommendation under Rule 196. Therefore, it is appropriate to submit proposed amendments for the Board's consideration as possible recommendations. However, as the proposed amendments have been taken out, this issue is now moot.

The Examiner also suggests that the brief fails to present reasons why the claims do not fall or stand together. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the reasons are clearly stated in the argument section that discusses the grouping of the claims. As stated on pages 15-16 of the appeal brief:

The claims on appeal do not stand or fall together, since they contain distinct recitations which are relevant to patentability and to the specific rejections stated. For

RECEIVED

DEC 11 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

example, in addition to the claim extracts quoted above from Claims 1, 16, and 48:

Claims 11 and 24 separately recite, among other differing limitations, that “said clipping algorithm is the Sutherland and Hodgman polygon clipping algorithm.”

Claim 15 recites, among other limitations, that “said circular buffer has a maximum storage of sixteen vertices.”

Claim 16 recites, among other limitations, “circuitry to set an outcode value for each of said vertices indicating whether it is visible with respect to individual planes of said view volume.”

Claim 16 also recites, among other limitations, “circuitry to define all vertices of a primitive using relational coordinates....”

Claim 21 also recites, among other limitations, barycentric coordinates.

Claim 48 is very different from the other independent claims. For example, Claim 48 recites, among other limitations, both a transformation unit and also a geometry unit.

Claim 48 also recites, among other limitations, video rendering hardware.

Claim 48 also recites, among other limitations, display hardware.

Claim 48 also recites, among other limitations, a processor connected to provide graphics data.

Each claim should be considered separately; or at the very least each claim which is argued separately in the preceding sections of this brief should be considered separately. Argument: The fact that the claims use different formulations (as detailed above) and/or have been argued separately, shows that, if their

patentability is not considered separately, any adverse decision would show that the limitations of some claims had been unfairly ignored.

Although the Examiner is entitled to her opinion as to the merits of the argument, an argument has been made nonetheless.

As all the grounds of alleged non-compliance have now been corrected, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner submit the enclosed appeal briefs to the Board.

Any extension of time necessary to prevent abandonment has been requested, and any fee necessary for consideration of this paper has been authorized to be charged to Deposit Account Number 07-2320.

Respectfully submitted,



N. Elizabeth Pham, Reg.No. 49,042

Customer Number 29106

Attorney for Applicant

11330 Valley Dale Drive, Dallas TX 75230

214-363-3038

groover@technopatents.com

December 9, 2003